

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 and 42-60 are pending in the application and claims 1-12 stand rejected.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that claims 42-47 and 60 are allowed.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-4 and 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,073,091 to Kanevsky et al. ("Kanevsky '091"). At the very minimum, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and patentable over Kanevsky '091 because Kanevsky '091 does not disclose *generating a language component vocabulary VC comprising word forms and word form components*, as essentially claimed in claim 1 and 48. Examiner contends (in the Response to Arguments section) that Kanevsky '091 discloses a vocabulary of word forms and word form components. It is respectfully submitted that such assertion is erroneous.

Indeed, Kanevsky '091 discloses an arithmetic-based approach whereby word forms are split using modular arithmetic by mapping word forms into two or more numbers (integer vectors). Kanevsky '091 does not disclose *a language component vocabulary VC comprising word forms and word form components*, as claimed in claim 1. In fact, it is the "split" numbers that are utilized as the vocabulary components. The differences of Kanevsky '091 and the claimed inventions is clearly described on pages 4-6 of the current specification.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 48 are not anticipated by Kanevsky '091. Moreover, claims 2-4 and 48-51 are not anticipated by Kanevsky '091 at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).


**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 5, 7-12, 52 and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky '091 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,888 to Kanevsky et al. ("Kanevsky '888"). In addition, claims 6 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanevsky '091 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,754 to Karaali et al.

Claims 2-12 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. Each of the above obviousness rejections is based, in part, on Examiner's contention that Kanevsky '091 anticipates claim 1. Therefore, in view of the above discussion with respect to claim 1, the obviousness rejections are legally deficient on their face.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank V. DeRosa

Reg. No. 43,584

Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL.: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889